

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL D. HILLEY,
Plaintiff,

v.

MAXAR TECHNOLOGIES HOLDINGS
INC., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 24-cv-03143-VC

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
REMAND**

Re: Dkt. No. 10

Hilley's Motion to Remand is denied because diversity jurisdiction exists under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). This order assumes the reader's familiarity with the facts of the case, the legal standard, and the applicable law.

Hilley concedes that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000 so the only question is whether there is complete diversity of citizenship between the parties. Hilley is a citizen of California. As for the defendants, Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and Maxar Technologies Inc. are both incorporated in Delaware and have their principal place of business in Colorado.¹ There are also two LLC defendants—Maxar Space LLC and Maxar Space Holdings LLC. Unlike corporations, “an LLC is a citizen of every state of which its owners/members are citizens.” *Johnson v. Columbia Properties Anchorage, LP*, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006). Maxar Space LLC's only member is Maxar Space Holdings LLC and Maxar Space Holdings LLC's only member is Maxar Technologies Inc. As already mentioned, Maxar Technologies Inc. is a

¹ While at times it seems like Hilley argues that these defendants' principal place of business is California instead of Colorado, in his motion he also concedes that both corporate entities have their principal office of corporation in Westminster, Colorado. *See* Dkt. No. 10 at 7.

citizen of Delaware and Colorado. Thus, all of the defendants are citizens of Delaware and Colorado, meaning there is complete diversity of citizenship between Hilley and the defendants.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 16, 2024

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'VCH', is positioned above a horizontal line.

VINCE CHHABRIA
United States District Judge